



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/658,393	09/08/2000	Kathrin Berkner	074451.P110	3421

7590 11/20/2006
Michael J Mallie
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

LEE, TOMMY D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2625

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/658,393

Applicant(s)

BERKNER ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas D. Lee

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9,38-47,84-86 and 119-123 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 84-86 and 123 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9,38-47 and 119-122 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office action is responsive to applicant's amendment filed September 19, 2006. Claims 1-9, 38-47, 84-86 and 119-123 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 1, 2, 38-40 and 120-122 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over International Publication WO 99/28865 (Decegama) in view of U.S. Patent 5,748,786 (Zandi et al.).

Regarding claims 1, 2, 38, 120 and 121, Decegama discloses a system comprising: a wavelet-based image processing path to enhance an input image in a wavelet domain, comprising a forward wavelet transform (multistage wavelet transform filter 50 (page 6, lines 7-23)), one or more wavelet-based processing blocks (enhancement system 10 (page 7, lines 18-22)), and an inverse wavelet transform (multistage inverse transform filter 22 (page 9, line 27 – page 10, line 20)); and a print engine coupled to the processing path (output device 62 may be a printer (page 5, lines 23-27)). The system further comprises an input operable to receive the input image from an external source and a scanner for generating the input image, wherein the input and the scanner are coupled to the image processing path (signal source 68 may be a scanner; input device may be a keyboard 64)).

Decegama does not disclose a unit to sharpen or smooth text and image regions of the image data corresponding to the input image, wherein the image processing path further includes a classifier, the classifier to control reduction of image noise, smoothing or the image, and sharpening of the image. Zandi et al. disclose this limitation (column 15, lines 6-27). In view of Zandi et al., one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the teaching of Decegama by providing a unit for sharpening or smoothing the image data, because such a unit enhances the detail of the output image.

Regarding claims 39, 40 and 122, Decegama discloses a method comprising: processing an input image by enhancing the input image, including applying a forward wavelet transform to create a plurality of coefficients and filtering coefficients with a coefficient domain operator in a wavelet domain (multistage wavelet transform filter 50 (page 6, lines 7-23)); and outputting a processed image (output device 62). The method further comprises: applying one or more wavelet-based processing blocks to coefficients resulting from applying the forward wavelet transform (enhancement system 10 (page 7, lines 18-22)); and applying an inverse wavelet transform (multistage inverse wavelet transform filter 22 (page 9, line 27 – page 10, line 20)).

Decegama does not disclose sharpening or smoothing text and image data in the wavelet domain corresponding to the input image, wherein the processing an input image further includes applying a classifier to the plurality of coefficients prior to thresholding. Zandi et al. disclose this limitation (column 15, lines 6-27). In view of Zandi et al., one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the

Art Unit: 2625

teaching of Decegama by providing a unit for sharpening or smoothing the image data, because such a unit enhances the detail of the output image.

4. Claims 39, 40 and 122 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,497,777 (Abdel-Malek et al.) in view of Zandi et al.

Regarding claims 39, 40 and 122, Abdel-Malek et al. disclose a method comprising: processing an input image by enhancing the input image, including applying a forward wavelet transform to create a plurality of coefficients and filtering coefficients with a coefficient domain operator in a wavelet domain (wavelet transform processor 36 (column 4, lines 21-44)); and outputting a processed image (display system 18 outputs processed image (column 6, lines 42-49)). The method further comprises: applying one or more wavelet-based processing blocks to coefficients resulting from applying the forward wavelet transform (threshold processor 38 processing wavelet transform signal (Fig. 2) to remove noise (column 5, line 42 – column 6, line 10); and applying an inverse wavelet transform (inverse wavelet processor 42 (column 6, lines 10-18)).

Abdel-Malek et al. do not disclose sharpening or smoothing text and image data in the wavelet domain corresponding to the input image, wherein the processing an input image further includes applying a classifier to the plurality of coefficients prior to thresholding or denoising. As mentioned above, Zandi et al. disclose this limitation (column 15, lines 6-27). In view of Zandi et al., one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the teaching of Abdel-Malek et al. by providing a unit for sharpening or smoothing the image data, because such a unit enhances the detail of the output image.

Art Unit: 2625

5. Claim 119 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,905,579 (Katayama et al.) in view of Zandi et al.

Katayama et al. disclose a copier having a wavelet-based image processing path for enhancing image data (wavelet transforming circuit 2, edge detecting circuit 3, character detecting circuit 4 (column 3, lines 29-47); for use in a copier (column 1, lines 11-18)).

Katayama et al. do not disclose a unit to sharpen or smooth text and image regions of the image data corresponding to the image data. As mentioned above, Zandi et al. disclose this limitation (column 15, lines 6-27). In view of Zandi et al., one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the teaching of Katayama et al. by providing a unit for sharpening or smoothing the image data, because such a unit enhances the detail of the output image.

6. Claims 3 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Decegama in view of Zandi et al. and U.S. Patent 5,412,741 (Shapiro).

Neither Decegama nor Zandi et al. explicitly disclose a critically sampled wavelet transform. The type of wavelet transform is well known in the art, as noted by Shapiro (column 1, lines 34-38). Applicant has not disclosed that the use of a critically sampled wavelet transform provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected applicant's invention to perform equally well using any one of a number of well-known wavelet transform processes depending on the image data to be reduced, including the critically sampled wavelet transform, because all wavelet transforms effectively reduce

Art Unit: 2625

the amount of image data for storage or transmission. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to apply a critically sampled wavelet transform to the combined teaching of Decegama and Zandi et al.

7. Claims 4, 5, 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Decegama in view of Zandi et al. and U.S. Patent 6,236,745 (Chen et al.).

Neither Decegama nor Zandi et al. explicitly disclose an overcomplete or Haar wavelet transform. This type of wavelet transform is well known in the art, as noted by Chen et al. (column 3, lines 48-58). Applicant has not disclosed that the use of an overcomplete or Haar wavelet transform provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected applicant's invention to perform equally well using any one of a number of well-known wavelet transform processes depending on the image to be reduced, including the overcomplete or Haar transform, because all wavelet transforms effectively reduce the amount of image data for storage or transmission. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to apply an overcomplete of Haar wavelet transform to the combined teaching of Decegama and Zandi et al.

8. Claims 6, 7, 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Decegama in view of Zandi et al. and U.S. Patent 6,148,111 (Creusere).

Neither Decegama nor Zandi et al. explicitly disclose a 5,3 or 2,6 wavelet transform. This type of wavelet transform is well known in the art, as noted by Creusere

Art Unit: 2625

(column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 1). Applicant has not disclosed that the use of a 5,3 or 2,6 wavelet transform provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected applicant's invention to perform equally well using any one of a number of well-known wavelet transform processes depending on the image data to be reduced, including the 5,3 or 2,6 wavelet transform, because all wavelet transforms effectively reduce the amount of image data for storage or transmission. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to apply a 5,3 or 2,6 wavelet transform to the combined teaching of Decegama and Zandi et al.

9. Claims 8 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Decegama in view of Zandi et al. and U.S. Patent 6,847,737 (Kouri et al.).

Neither Decegama nor Zandi et al. explicitly disclose a complex wavelet transform. This type of wavelet transform is well known in the art, as noted by Kouri et al. (column 32, lines 65-67). Applicant has not disclosed that the use of a complex wavelet transform provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected applicant's invention to perform equally well using any one of a number of well-known wavelet transform processes depending on the image data to be reduced, including the complex wavelet transform, because all wavelet transforms effectively reduce the amount of image data for storage or transmission. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to apply a complex wavelet transform to the combined teaching of Decegama and Zandi et al.

Art Unit: 2625

10. Claims 9 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Decegama in view of Zandi et al. and U.S. Patent 6,141,452 (Muran).

Neither Decegama nor Zandi et al. explicitly disclose a limited redundancy wavelet transform. This type of wavelet transform is well known in the art, as noted by Muran (column 3, lines 49-56). Applicant has not disclosed that the use of a limited redundancy wavelet transform provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected applicant's invention to perform equally well using any one of a number of well-known wavelet transform processes depending on the image data to be reduced, including the limited redundancy wavelet transform, because all wavelet transforms effectively reduce the amount of image data for storage or transmission. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to apply a limited redundancy wavelet transform to the combined teaching of Decegama and Zandi et al.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 84-86 and 123 are allowed.

12. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The cited prior art does not appear to disclose or suggest the combined steps of "performing denoising by thresholding coefficients generated by applying the forward wavelet transform to generate denoised coefficients," and "rescaling the denoised coefficients with a level-dependent parameter to sharpen or smooth the denoised coefficients," as now recited in amended base claim 84.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments, see pages 7 and 8 of the current amendment, filed September 19, 2006, with respect to the rejection of claims 84-86 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as set forth in the prior Office action, mailed May 2, 2006, have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of the claims has been withdrawn.

14. Applicant's arguments filed in response to the rejections of claims 1-9, 38-47 and 119-122 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1, 2, 38-40 and 120-122, applicant asserts that Zandi et al. "only describes distinguishing image types, without further processing text images and picture images," and thus fail to describe "a unit to sharpen or smooth text and image regions of the image data corresponding to the input image," as recited in base claims 1 and 39 (page 10 of current amendment). Applicant goes on to state: "However, Zandi again fails to describe performing any form of wavelet processing on both text and image regions of an image. Furthermore, Zandi does not describe the units that would accomplish the wavelet based image processing, other than stating a hierarchical wavelet decomposition scheme could be utilized." (pages 10 and 11 of current amendment). However, Zandi et al. clearly disclose: "Sharpening, edge enhancements, noise control, etc. may be performed using a hierarchical decomposition." (column 15, lines 23-25). This passage indicates that a sharpening unit may be provided in the teaching of Zandi et al. for enhancing the image data, thereby disclosing a unit to

Art Unit: 2625

sharpen or smooth image data. If the image data happens to include both text and image regions, it is clear that these regions would be processed by such a unit.

Regarding the remaining rejected claims 3-9, 41-47 and 119, applicant provides arguments similar to those provided with respect to claims 1 and 39, i.e., that Zandi et al. fail to disclose or suggest the sharpening or smoothing of text and image data in the wavelet domain corresponding to the input image (pages 12-15 of current amendment). As mentioned above, this limitation is indeed disclosed in Zandi et al.

Conclusion

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas D. Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7436. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30-5:00, alternate Fridays off.

Art Unit: 2625

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Thomas D Lee
Primary Examiner
Technology Division 2625

tdl
November 15, 2006